

## REPORT

"We're Not Finished Yet," Civil Society Warns

Page 3

## ANALYSIS

No Real Deal, and No Exit

Page 5

## REPORT

Farmers Are in the Business of Managing Carbon

Page 6

## INTERVIEW

Nous avons besoin d'un plan d'adaptation et non d'argent

Page 8

## ANALYSIS

'Perhaps We Should Just Sign'

Page 9

## COLUMN

Beyond Copenhagen

Page 12



Heading into the United Nations Conference on Climate Change, it seemed that everything was in place for what activists termed a fair, ambitious and binding deal on climate change.

In the end a non-binding "Copenhagen Accord" was signed by a small handful of countries. It offered a modest sum to the South for adaptation over the next few years, but failed to commit the world to limiting average temperature rise.

The science is unchanged by the failure:

if the planet warms beyond two degrees, we face catastrophe. For Africa - and many other developing countries - even two degrees spells chaos and the reversal of the fragile achievements in health, food security and economic development.

There is further negotiation to come, but time has run out.

The full responsibility for answering the greatest challenge yet to the continent's future has now been returned squarely to Africans themselves.





# Deal Without Agriculture is no Deal for Africa!

By **Sindiso Ngwenya**, Secretary-General of the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)

For Africa, climate change is not only an environmental issue but a serious challenge to economical and social development. The continent is already witnessing the impacts of climate change, characterised by various factors including constrained agricultural production and increasing food insecurity, increasing water stress and related conflicts.

These will worsen with time if decisive actions are not taken now. Such action is only possible if civil society, governments and other non-state actors intervene in a coordinated and knowledgeable manner. Against this background, it is important to ensure that the position taken by governments in the climate change policy negotiations incorporates the interests of all stakeholders particularly the civil society. For continental impact, there is a need to coordinate African institutions to collaborate and share experiences on the design and development of on-the-ground adaptation and mitigation initiatives, leading to the identification and promotion of best practices for and conservation agriculture. The implementation and promotion of these practices is intended to provide replicable operational models that will influence larger policy and programme development in Africa.

In 2009, COMESA and the Government of Norway signed a grant agreement in which Norway made available to COMESA a financial grant amounting to \$2.5 million for the implementation of the Climate Change The programme, a joint effort of COMESA, the East African Community (EAC) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) which is aimed at supporting the sub-region's vision and efforts to address climate change challenges, including its impact on socio-economic development and poverty reduction. Further, the programme will build and strengthen the capacity of African countries to address adaptation and mitigation to climate change, and to facilitate an African dialogue on the inclusion of sustainable agriculture and land-use practices, forestry, biodiversity conservation, and maintenance of environmental services in the post-Kyoto Climate regime.

COMESA, EAC and SADC seek to bring agriculture Reduced Emission to Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) into the centre of the climate change negotiation, recognising that the result would be a better global environment, improved agricultural productivity and land use, increased incomes for farmers and

poverty reduction in Africa.

COMESA calls for all African states to endorse and lobby for increased and more accessible global funding for climate adaptation and clean development mechanisms. Africa must optimise its full climate change mitigation and adaptation potential by ensuring that the reduction of green house gas emissions by agriculture, forests and sustainable land use (AFOLU) are included in the post-2012 climate change regime. A post- Kyoto deal without Agriculture is no deal for Africa!

The Copenhagen Conference was the culmination of a two-year negotiating process to enhance international climate change cooperation under the Bali Roadmap, launched by COP 13 in December 2007. The Conference attracted unprecedented participation and resulted in attendance by 120 Heads of State and Government, 10,500 delegates, 13,500 observers, and coverage by more than 3,000 media representatives. The negotiations process was characterized by over 1,000 intensive official, informal and group meetings among Parties which resulted in 23 decisions being adopted by the COP and the CMP. Observers discussed climate change in more than 400 meetings.

Governments engaged at the highest political level, and the outcome of that engagement was reflected in the Copenhagen Accord which was signed on Friday the 18th of December 2009.



>Sindiso Ngwenya,  
Secretary-General  
of COMESA



## TERRAVIVA

TerraViva is an independent publication of IPS-Inter Press Service news agency. The opinions expressed in TerraViva do not necessarily reflect the editorial views of IPS or the official position of any of its sponsors. This edition of TerraViva acknowledges the support of COMplus - the sustainable development communications alliance, Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) and the MDG3 Fund of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The daily online Copenhagen editions of TerraViva were organised and coordinated by IPS Latin America, with IPS Africa.

**Publisher:** Mario Lubetkin  
**Managing Editor:** Joaquín Costanzo  
**Chief Editor:** Diana Cariboni  
**Special Edition Editor:** Terna Gyuse  
**Editors:** Katherine Stapp, Stephanie Wildes, Sanjay Suri, Tess Bacalla, Darío Montero, Nalisha Kalideen  
**Lead Reporter:** Stephen Leahy  
**Reporters:** Nasseem Ackburally, Marina Barbosa, Darryl D'Monte (IFEJ), Daniela Estrada, Claudia Ciobanu, Rajiv Fernando, Enrique Gili, Joshua Kyalimpa, Mantoe Phakathi, Raul Pierri  
**Photographer and Video:** Ana Libisch  
**Illustrations:** Claudius  
**Design and layout:** tecuadra@tecuadra.com and Marshall Patsanza



com+  
www.complusalliance.org

MDG3Fund  
FANRPAN

IPS-Inter Press Service is a global news agency that provides news features, analyses and commentaries on the events and processes affecting the development of peoples and nations, especially in the South. A not-for-profit international association of journalists, IPS enjoys consultative status (Category I) with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Websites: www.ips.org, www.ipsnews.net, www.ipsnoticias.net

# “We’re Not Finished Yet,” Civil Society Warns

By Raúl Pierri and Daniela Estrada

COPENHAGEN — COP15 proved to be a “spectacular failure even according to its own terms,” but civil society had “some successes,” such as the inclusion of certain issues on the climate agenda, and making the voice of the South heard loud and clear.

That was how activists assessed their efforts at COP15 as the climate change talks came to an agonising end in Copenhagen.

Barred from the Bella Center, the official venue, and treated harshly by security forces at some of the massive demonstrations held throughout the two weeks of the conference, representatives of civil society – gathered simultaneously in the Danish capital at their own people’s climate summit, Klimaforum09 – highlighted a series of victories achieved.

“Despite the lack of transparency, civil society organisations have given visibility to positions that are more in line with climate justice, which we see as the only way to move towards a sustainable planet,” Eduardo Giesen, Latin American and Caribbean coordinator for Friends of the Earth International’s Climate Justice and Energy Programme, told TerraViva.

“We focused our efforts on supporting developing countries so they could present a united front against the demands of the industrialised world, and not give in to pressures that in some cases bordered on colonialism,” he added.

Klimaforum09 closed its two weeks of activities with a concert and a ceremony where this year’s organisers transferred organisational duties to representatives of Mexico and Latin America, where the next parallel summit will be held in 2010.

“The general feeling is that what wasn’t achieved at the Bella Center was achieved at Klimaforum” in terms of content consensus and forging of alliances, Giesen said.

For her part, Canadian journalist and researcher Naomi Klein called on activists to not give up hope. “I think it’s really important to make sure that we don’t leave this gathering feeling discouraged,” she said.

According to Klein, the fact that negotiators at the Bella Center were unable to reach an agreement even within their own conception of how to address climate change is proof that it is a failed model.

“That’s why it is very important to go forward and tell a different story of what happened here in Copenhagen. That story must be that their model reveals itself to be a spectacular failure even according to its own terms,” she said.

In Klein’s view, the model has failed because of its emphasis on the carbon market and other market-based mechanisms: “Discourse



> Protestors take to the streets during the Copenhagen conference as they advocate for a cut in Greenhouse gases.

Credit: TerraViva/Stephen Leahy

about climate change has been really taken over by technocrats, (it’s become) very bureaucratized, and has been extremely exclusive. This is actually similar to the discussion on trade a decade ago, where it was all acronyms, all incredible impenetrable long talks.”

For his part, Giesen condemned international NGOs that “toe the line” of industrialised countries and back counterproductive mechanisms.

Klein highlighted what she saw as the “successes” of the last two weeks. “The rich world can no longer claim not to know (what) failing to act (entails). The voices of the South, the cost of millions of lives, the disappearance of countries and cultures – all that has landed on the agenda,” she said.

## Changing the system

“System Change – Not Climate Change,” is the title of the final statement from Klimaforum09, signed by some 360 organizations from around the world. Drafted months ago and discussed over the last week in the Danish capital, this “People’s Declaration” argues that “there are solutions to the climate crisis,” and puts forward six demands.

“What people and the planet need is a just and sustainable transition of our societies to a form that will ensure the rights of life and dignity of all people and deliver a more fertile planet and more fulfilling lives to present and future generations,” it states.

The signatory organisations called on governments to take urgent climate action, most importantly the “complete abandonment of fossil fuels within the next 30 years, which must include specific milestones for every five-

year period.”

They also demanded “an immediate cut in GHG (greenhouse gases) of industrialized countries of at least 40 percent compared to 1990 levels by 2020,” and “recognition, payment and compensation of climate debt for the overconsumption of atmospheric space and adverse effects of climate change on all affected groups and people.”

The statement goes on to reject “purely market-oriented and technology-centred false and dangerous solutions,” such as “nuclear energy, agro-fuels, carbon capture and storage, Clean Development Mechanisms, biochar, genetically ‘climate-readied’ crops, geoengineering, and reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD).”

The “real solutions” are “based on safe, clean, renewable, and sustainable use of natural resources, as well as transitions to food, energy, land, and water sovereignty.”

The signatory organisations also proposed that an “equitable tax on carbon emissions” be established instead of “the regime of tradable emission quotas,” and that multilateral financial bodies like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund “be replaced by democratic and equitable institutions functioning in accordance with the United Nations Charter.”

They also demanded a “mechanism for strict surveillance and control of the operations of TNCs (transnational corporations).”

“Irrespective of the outcome of the Copenhagen Summit on Climate Change, there is an urgent need to build a global movement of movements dedicated to the long-term task of promoting a sustainable transition of our societies,” the statement concludes.

## “The Struggle Does Not Stop Here,” Say Witnesses at Climate Hearing



Credit: Claudia Ciobanu/IPS

> Climate witnesses at first international climate hearing

By Claudia Ciobanu

COPENHAGEN – “Those who run the decision-making on climate change are the same who have caused it,” said Archbishop Desmond Tutu at the world’s first international climate hearing.

He was pithily identifying the reason why justice had been elusive at the ongoing climate change summit in the Danish capital. Over the past year, more than one and a half million people from 36 countries around the world have participated in national climate hearings, testifying on how climate change has wreaked havoc in their lives and asking for justice.

“This is a case of deep injustice,” said the Archbishop who led the hearings along with former U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson.

“We are holding this international climate hearing at a critical moment in the negotiations,” said Jeremy Hobbs, the executive director of Oxfam International, which hosted the hearings.

“The stories of the climate witnesses should provide the moral imperative for a fair deal in Copenhagen,” said Hobbs.

The reality of the crisis in negotiations loomed large over the hearings as the conflict between the industrialised and the developing world surfaced. And the messages from the climate change witnesses stood out the louder for it.

Speaking in the name of his indigenous brothers from Latin America, Caetano Juanca, a farmer from Cuzco, Peru, told the international audience in Copenhagen that his people were suffering without being guilty, and called for an agreement that “respects Pachamama (Mother Earth)”.

Pelonesi Alofa from Trinidad and Tobago said that the COP15 negotiators are “buying and selling” the lives of people. “Don’t we understand that climate change is not negotiable?” she asked. “I have now understood that COP15 is beyond climate change, beyond Tobago.”

*“Don’t we understand that climate change is not negotiable?”*

Constance Okolet from Uganda explained that her people do not know any more when to plant and when to harvest, that they are eating only once a day, and that seasons have disappeared. “I am here to tell the world leaders that we want our seasons back!” she told the audience.

Shorbanu Khatun from Bangladesh, the last to testify, recounted how, as traditional crops failed in her village, her husband was reduced to foraging for food, only to be killed by a wild animal. Later on, her home was destroyed by a cyclone. “At first I thought God was punishing us,” she said, “but I have come to understand that it is man-made.” Robinson concluded the hearings by stating that not only were the effects of climate change brought about by the actions of industrialised countries but they were being felt disproportionately by people who cannot be blamed for climate change.

“The failure of industrialised countries to act with urgency is leading us all to social and international disorder,” she warned.

The people’s fundamental right to “international and social order” (a basic principle in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights) is denied through the manner in which decisions about how to tackle climate change are being made, she said.

Robinson asked for industrialised countries to commit immediately to 40 percent emissions reductions by 2020 based on 1990 levels and to offer long-term – and additional – funding worth 200 billion US dollars annually until 2020 – half for adaptation and half for mitigation.

“I do not trust the governments of industrialised countries because they are only interested in money and they do not care about Pachamama,” Caetano Juanca told TerraViva. “But I trust the people, the work done through churches and communities – there are people who care.”

Asked what would happen if a fair deal was not signed in Copenhagen, Juanca responded: “We will continue to fight until they listen to us. Our struggle does not stop here.”



> Workers on Malawi tea estate: a temperature increase of over two degrees celsius could lay waste to both commercial and subsistence agriculture.

# No Real Deal, and No Exit

By Stephen Leahy

**COPENHAGEN** - The roof of our house is on fire but our leaders, our economic system and we ourselves are ignoring the alarms and continuing to add more fuel. There are no exit doors in our house; there is nowhere else to go.

Dangerous climate change is already here. The two-week climate summit in Copenhagen came to an end with disappointing results. But coral reefs are dying, the Arctic is melting and rising sea levels threaten the homes of millions. And we're on our way to a planet-transforming four-degree Celsius rise in global average temperatures in as soon as 50 years.

Future generations could face an utterly transformed planet, where large areas will be seven to 14 degrees C warmer, making them uninhabitable. In this world-on-fire, the one to two metre sea level rise by 2100 will leave hundreds of millions homeless, according to the latest science presented at the "4 Degrees and Beyond, International Climate Science Conference" at the University of Oxford in September.

That's the science-based, slap-in-the-face reality as the Copenhagen climate talks fizzled out.

"Our leaders do not get the scale of the problem or the rapidity of the changes. They don't get that it must be dealt with now," said Andrew Weaver, a climatologist at Canada's University of British Columbia and lead author of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports.

"Now" means that global carbon emissions peak in five years and begin to decline shortly thereafter to near zero by 2050, according to a report summarising the very latest science by the world's top climate scientists, including Weaver. Called "The Copenhagen Diagnosis, 2009: Updating the World on the Latest Climate Science", it was released a week before the talks began in Copenhagen.

"More modest, achievable targets in the short term will get the planet on the right track,"

Canada's Prime Minister Stephen Harper has been often quoted as saying. Harper's "modest" target for Canada amounts to a three-percent reduction from 1990 levels by 2020. The U.S. target is little better.

Based on the scientific evidence, the world's best and brightest climate scientists conclude that Canada and other industrialised nations must reduce emissions 25 to 40 percent by 2020 compared to 1990 to have any hope of keeping the warming at two degrees.

"Two degrees will be a very difficult for modern society to cope with," said Pål Prestrud, an Arctic researcher and director of Center for International Climate and Environmental Research in Oslo, Norway.

Even if all emissions were cut off today, global temperatures would decline very slowly – over a period of a thousand years. "If we wait too long, it will be too late to do anything," Prestrud warned TerraViva.

No scientist considers stabilising the climate at two degrees warmer to be getting the planet on the right track. The Arctic is already melting at the present 0.8 Celsius of warming. There may be no sea ice in the summer in just 5 to 10 years.

What happens when the cold top of the world that drives the global weather system warms up? Temperature and precipitation patterns in Europe and North America will change, affecting agriculture, forestry and water supplies, the "Arctic Climate Feedbacks: Global Implications" report warned in September.

Worse still, a warmer Arctic will emit large volumes of carbon and methane, which are currently stored in the frozen soils called permafrost. Once that process gets underway, runaway global heating may be unstoppable.

At two degrees warmer, the majority of corals will die due to a combination of warmer temperatures and ocean acidification. Coral reefs are the nurseries for much of the fish in the oceans and hundreds of millions of people are dependent on

them. Sea level rise will displace many millions more.

Finally, two degrees of warming is only the global average. What it really means is that temperatures will range from one to four or five degrees hotter depending on the region. It also means at least one metre of sea level rise by 2100. Countries in Africa, small islands states and the least developed countries are calling for a 1.5 Celsius target here.

Humans have enjoyed 10,000 years of climate stability, in which the global average temperature varied less than one degree – even during the Little Ice Age and Middle Warming Period, says Robert Corell, director of the Global Change Programme at the H. John Heinz III Center for Science, Economics, and the Environment in Washington, DC.

Global emissions over the past five years have been above the worst case scenarios of the IPCC, and on a path for a five- to six-degree rise in temperatures by 2100, Corell told TerraViva.

He also warned that Earth's natural absorbers of carbon, the oceans and forests, are taking up less carbon every year, meaning concentrations of heat-trapping carbon will increase faster than expected.

"I am sorry to say," writes James Hansen, "that most of what politicians are doing on the climate front is greenwashing – their proposals sound good, but they are deceiving you and themselves at the same time."

One of the most respected climate experts, Hansen is director of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies.

"Governments are stating emission goals that they know are lies," Hansen wrote in the Observer newspaper in November.

"Are we going to stand up and give global politicians a hard slap in the face, to make them face the truth?" he asked. "It will take lot of us – probably in the streets. Or are we going to let them continue to kid themselves and us, and cheat our children and grandchildren?"

# Farmers Are in the Business

By Terna Gyuse

COPENHAGEN – There's a satisfying beauty to this phrase: "Productivity in perpetuity, without ecological harm."

Professor M.S. Swaminathan, the celebrated giant of agricultural research from India, offered these words early on in a day devoted to farmers and sustainable food security at the University of Copenhagen's Faculty of Life Sciences.

This important side meeting of the United Nations Conference on Climate Change had two clear objectives: to build consensus on what needs to be done to incorporate agriculture into the post-Copenhagen climate agenda, and to discuss strategies and action to address adaptation and mitigation in the agriculture sector.

The problem is straightforward. The world needs food production to more than double by 2050 to feed a growing population; a changing climate threatens to send agricultural output in the opposite direction, quickly add-

ing to the billion people who already live with chronic hunger.

Agricultural activities contribute to greenhouse gas emissions directly and indirectly; yet farmers could be an important part of the solution.

This is the backdrop against which farmers, scientists, policy-makers and activists met to discuss agriculture and rural development.

A key thread running from the keynote speakers through panelists and contributions from the floor was the idea that agriculture is where poverty reduction, food security and climate change intersect.

Yet Kanayo Nwanze, president of the International Fund for Agricultural Development, reminded participants that development assistance and support for agriculture have for so long declined while demand has risen. But Nwanze sees renewed interest in funding rural development by donors in the North and a fresh focus on agriculture by governments in the South, as the impending danger to political instability and food security becomes clearer.

"For each one degree rise in temperature, the wheat yield in India will be six million tonnes less," said Swaminathan, a loss equivalent to 1.5 billion dollars. Without effective adaptation, 44 percent of agricultural productivity



> The world needs food production to more than double by 2050 to feed a growing population; a changing climate threatens to send agricultural output in the opposite direction, quickly adding to the billion people who already live with chronic hunger.

# Issues of Managing Carbon

could be lost.

Swaminathan, who was instrumental in developing and introducing high-yielding varieties of wheat in India, spoke of the importance of anticipatory research to counter this – conserving seeds to ensure the genetic resources needed for resilient crops are not lost, and studying and improving our knowledge of growing food in coastal regions vulnerable to influxes of salt water.

Sir Gordon Conway, professor of international development at Imperial College, London says the drivers of global warming are still ill-understood.

It's not that there's doubt that there will be significant changes in temperature and rainfall patterns, it's that researchers still do not know precisely how, for example, the El Niño/La Niña ocean current, monsoons, and changing tropical convection patterns interact to affect temperature and rainfall patterns.

Conway said we need to downscale global predictions of climate models to local levels in order to guide appropriate action. "We need projections of weather variables that mean something to farmers, not just climatologists,

such as, 'The first rains, how many days will they last?'"

That information would allow scientists, governments and farmers themselves to develop appropriately resilient crops, as well as livestock and farming systems suited to new conditions, and to set up and manage water resources better.

Lindiwe Sibanda, director of the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Advocacy Network based in South Africa, underlined the central importance of involving farmers in finding solutions. She called for an increase in locally-generated research, and the effective communication of findings and recommendations to farmers themselves.

Speaking from the floor of one session, a farmer from southern Ontario said simply, "Farmers are in the business of managing carbon." For thousands of years, farmers have bred crop varieties to suit an incredible range of environments; the food on our table comes to us all through their hands.

"We may be 14 percent of the problem," he said, referring to agriculture's contribution to total carbon emissions, "but we could be 25 percent of the solution."

## Adaptation Funds Must Reach Africa's Women Farmers

By Mantoe Phakathi

COPENHAGEN – One of the key components of global action on climate change will be measures to adapt to changes that are already unavoidable. The Global Gender and Climate Alliance argues that specific attention be paid to the needs of women.

"With climate change taking away their source of livelihood because of the erratic weather patterns preventing them from farming, women must find another means of making a living," said Rachel Harris, the media coordinator for GGCA.

Women make up a majority of smallholder farmers in Africa and in other developing countries.

In contrast to the options open to many men, few women can respond to drought, for example, by relocating to cities or other rural areas in search of work. Women are often tied down by the need to care for children, or social obstacles to mobility; they are also frequently without even the smallest cash savings of their own or assets to sell to bridge hard times.

Rodney Cooke, the director of the Technical Advisory Division at the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), admitted that previous funding mechanisms overlooked women farmers.

"We've made mistakes before," said Cooke. "Women make up 70 percent of smallholder farmers, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, but somehow funding targets were disproportionately directed towards men."

Cooke's employer, IFAD, is the U.N. agency charged with supporting rural livelihoods; the organisation was set up in response to a crisis of food security in the 1970s. Cooke said there were no clear guidelines attached to previous funding on how women would benefit.

The alliance isn't waiting for a deal to be reached to complain that gender-blind funding is failing the women who may need it most. Instead they are initiating proposals that will ensure women are the agents of change, able to create and adopt new agricultural options and explore other entrepreneurial ventures as a way of adapting to climate change.

Constance Okeletti, a smallholder farmer from Uganda, said women have a lot of knowledge useful for adaptation because they work with the environment through their household duties: include fetching water, gathering firewood and fruits and farming.

"We've been trying to adapt since climate change started to affect us. With the money we can do more," she said.

Okeletti observed that most development aid to African countries does not penetrate to the women at grassroots level because there are no specific provisions of how much of it should go to the poor.

"We don't know whether it's eaten by politicians or the workers in the cities," said Okeletti, who is representing a network of 40 groups of small-scale farmers in Uganda.

"Women fail to hold those in authority to account because we don't even know how much was meant for helping out women," she continued.

"We expect the final text of the declaration to emphasise the percentage of the funds that are expected to assist women projects so that they adapt to climate change," said Okeletti.

GGCA, in collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), has come up with a women's Green Business Initiative to promote women's entrepreneurship opportunities in the sphere of climate change adaptation and mitigation to try and tap into the

climate change funding.

"For example through the initiative a local women's group in Rwanda uses a voluntary carbon credit grant to implement a bamboo project for income generation and environmental protections," said Lucy Wanjiru UNDP's gender and climate change and GGCA.

She said with funding from the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), the Adaptation Fund, and new money coming from reduction of emissions from deforestation and degradation (REDD) schemes, women could be the ones accessing funds to start ecologically sustainable projects – be that planting trees or managing eco-tourism ventures – and earn a living.

"Agriculture is the sector most vulnerable to climate change," said Cooke. "An extra two million people in sub-Saharan Africa are going to be affected by water shortages and the majority of these are women."

To be effective, any deal will have to incorporate a gendered perspective.



Credit: Mantoe Phakathi / IPS

> Women buying - and selling - drought-resistant seed in Matsanjeni, Swaziland.

# 'Nous avons besoin d'un plan d'adaptation et non d'argent'



> Edouard Yao: "Après Copenhague, c'est une bataille qui débutera, un défi qu'il faudra relever."

Credit: Fulgence Zamblé / IPS

## Fulgence Zamblé s'entretient avec EDOUARD YAO

ABIDJAN -En dépit d'une marche de mobilisation contre les changements climatiques avortée en décembre dans la capitale économique ivoirienne, Abidjan, pour des raisons d'organisation, Edouard Yao, coordinateur Côte d'Ivoire de l'organisation non gouvernementale LEAD Africa, ne démord pas.

Pour lui, les populations africaines ont besoin d'être largement informées sur la question climatique. Ce pourquoi, pendant les négociations de Copenhague, au Danemark, l'organisation dont il est le coordinateur organise dans cinq villes africaines des séances de visualisation en direct de Copenhague, suivies d'exposés et de débats en ligne et hors ligne.

Ainsi des populations suivent en direct les négociations sur les changements climatiques. Cependant, ce qui l'intrigue, c'est le fait que les pays africains n'aient pas suffisamment préparé le rendez-vous du Danemark. Selon Yao, l'Afrique manque d'arguments (aucun chiffre, aucun plan d'action, aucune stratégie d'adaptation) à Copenhague, et elle ne devrait pas récolter grand-chose.

Dans cet entretien accordé à IPS/TerraViva, Edouard Yao explique la politique qui aurait pu sortir le continent africain grand des discussions du COP 15.

**Q: Quel intérêt à proposer les négociations de Copenhague en vision conférence aux populations?**

**R:** Sachez que tout le monde n'est pas informé de ce qui se discute actuellement au Danemark. Même certains intellectuels n'en savent rien. Chez le citoyen lambda, tout ce qui lui arrive avec la forte chaleur, les pluies diluviennes, le cycle cultural bouleversé et autres ont d'autres sens. Mais ils n'ont pas l'information scientifique.

Aujourd'hui que nous avons les discussions de Copenhague en direct, ils sont médusés, hyper satisfaits.

**Q: Sentez-vous déjà une prise de conscience de leur part?**

**R:** Bien entendu. Et nous leur faisons comprendre que les autorités ne peuvent pas tout faire pour lutter contre le réchauffement climatique.

Nous devons responsabiliser la société civile. Après Copenhague,

c'est une bataille qui débutera, un défi qu'il faudra relever. Car, en fonction des résultats des négociations, il faudra sensibiliser tout le monde. Nous devons le faire ensemble.

**Q: Approuvez-vous les principales requêtes du continent africain et des autres pays émergents aux négociations?**

**R:** Notre souhait et qui est celui des populations, est que les négociations aboutissent à la réduction des gaz à effet de serre à un taux ambitieux et raisonnable. Ce sera l'apport important des pays développés.

Pour ce qui de l'Afrique, elle a déjà manqué le départ des négociations. Aujourd'hui, nous avons besoin d'un plan d'adaptation en bonne forme et non pas d'argent. Dans les pays africains, il n'existe pas de statistiques fiables pour chaque Etat. Tout est global. Il aurait fallu effectuer une recherche sur des données avant de se présenter au Danemark.

Car, même si l'enveloppe de 200 milliards de dollars était accordée, sur quel base cela serait reparti et quel serait le mécanisme de gestion quand on sait qu'il existe des problèmes de gouvernance dans certains pays. Encore qu'il n'est pas certain que cette somme résolve définitivement le mal qui menace le continent. Alors cet argent ne servira à rien.

**Q: Pour vous, qu'est-ce qui devait être proposé par le G77?**

**R:** En prenant singulièrement l'Afrique, nous aurions pu mettre en avant l'énergie verte dont nous disposons avec le soleil et l'énergie éolienne que nous pouvons développer sur le continent, concevoir des plans dans ce sens.

Il y a ce potentiel qui existe sur le continent et que nous pouvons exploiter pour le revendre aux pays développés. Il faut des mesures pour contrôler les feux de brousses, les importations de véhicules d'occasion...

La politique de la main tendue n'est pas celle-là qui va nous tirer d'affaire. Car en même temps que le continent exige la réduction des gaz à effet de serre, il demande des moyens financiers. C'est paradoxal en ce sens que les moyens qui seront dégagés par les pays développés proviennent en grande partie de l'usage des gaz à effets de serre. A eux seuls, ils ne peuvent pas consentir un double sacrifice.

**Q: A vous entendre, l'Afrique n'était pas prête pour ce rendez-vous?**

**R:** Elle n'a pas cherché à être prête. Avant le sommet de Copenhague, l'Europe était à Barcelone pour trouver des solutions. Pendant ce temps, l'Afrique ne songeait qu'à une position commune sur la réduction du gaz à effet de serre et le montant qui doit lui être alloué.

Sortir des négociations comme nos représentants l'ont fait lundi dernier n'était que du bluff. Ils voulaient juste fixer la barre un peu haute et indiquer qu'ils étaient sur le qui-vive. Sinon, le continent africain n'a véritablement pas anticipé sur la question des changements climatiques au point où l'Europe va créer son énergie verte pour s'en sortir et nous convoyer ces véhicules à carburant qui vont encore polluer l'air.

# 'Perhaps We Should Just Sign'

By Servaas van den Bosch

WINDHOEK - Countries are quietly signing up to the Copenhagen Accord, but commitments on emissions cuts and funding remain unclear.

"We have to decide by this Sunday whether we sign the Copenhagen Accord, or not. If we don't, we have no access to the 30 billion dollar quick startup fund," Namibian Prime Minister Nahas Angula told a gathering of businessmen in Windhoek at the end of January. "Perhaps we should just take it."

Angula was wrong on the first point: faced with a less than enthusiastic response from the 194 Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), its executive secretary, Yvo de Boer, dropped the Jan. 31 deadline long before Angula's predicament arose.

That nobody in the Namibian government seemed to be aware of this is revealing.

The second part of Angula's statement, however, is on the money. Why, indeed, not "just take it"? As Angula reminded his audience, the Accord is not binding, nor does it require any action from developing countries.

The rushed "letter of association", sent out the next day by environment minister Netumbo Nandi-Ndaitwah, made a vague reference to Namibia's "abundant renewable energy sources" and its willingness to profit from "mechanisms available under the Kyoto Protocol".

## Africa not in accord

Ninety-four countries - about half of those present in Copenhagen - have endorsed the Accord one way or another, including the world's top ten emitters. But a far lower percentage of African governments have submitted, with only 15 out of 53 African countries making Accord commitments by early February.

Eleven of the fifteen are least developed countries (LDCs), highly dependent on development aid. Still, that number accounts for just a third of the 33 LDCs in Africa. Notably absent - albeit probably for widely diverging reasons - are Africa's oil-producing nations and small island states.

"We note that a few areas need to be considered as we build this Accord to deliver a solid and legally binding agreement at COP16 that meets the world's expectations for effective climate change action," writes Malawi. It reiterates the call for a maximum 1.5 degree temperature rise, more time to develop Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions and 1.5 percent of developed countries'



> Will the Copenhagen Accord's framework encourage farmers like these women in Rundu, Namibia to conserve tree cover.

GDP in climate funding.

Sierra Leone reminds the UNFCCC that the Accord was never "formally adopted" by the parties "and therefore is not an official outcome of COP15." It also warns the UNFCCC "the Copenhagen Accord must not replace the Kyoto Protocol and should not be subsumed under the Copenhagen Accord".

## Mitigation

Do the pledges on the table address African countries' concerns over funding and temperature rise? Six African countries - three LDCs - submitted their own plans for mitigation to the UNFCCC. These mostly focus on setting up climate change committees or list "green" energy initiatives that are in the pipeline.

Several others, like the Republic of Congo and Madagascar, make any actions conditional on a REDD-deal. Others reserve the right to continue their chosen high carbon development paths.

"Botswana is and will continue to be a carbon intensive economy - mainly coal-based," notes the country's U.N. ambassador in his letter.

Only South Africa puts numbers to its commitment, reiterating a pledge "to enable a 34 percent deviation below the 'business as usual' emissions growth trajectory by 2020", a promise that already has been slammed as unrealistic by South African environmental groups.

Developed nations do little better. On Feb. 2, the U.N. admitted frankly that the commitments on the table are not enough to keep temperature rise below the agreed 2 degrees Celsius target. Green-

peace calculated that the pledges in fact will lead to a 3-4 degree temperature rise, almost double what countries agreed to just six weeks ago.

"Supporters of the Accord have failed to make emissions pledges which are strong enough to avert dangerous climate change," said Greenpeace climate chief Bernhard Obermayr. "The Accord's 31 January deadline was no more than a cynical PR exercise allowing governments to recycle existing pledges and dress them up as effective action."

## Funding

Confusion also surrounds the 30 billion dollar "quick start" fund of "new and additional resources" to be made available for adaptation strategies between now and 2012.

Sierra Leone writes that it would "appreciate a breakdown of this amount to be benefited by each country" and says it's "deeply concerned that there is no guarantee the most vulnerable countries will benefit from this fund".

While the Accord says "LDCs, small island states and Africa" should have priority, it's unclear how the money will be allocated, or where it will come from. An early draft of the Accord included commitments from the EU (\$10.6 billion), Japan (\$11 billion) and the United States (\$3.6 billion), but that annex did not appear with the final text.

"I went to Copenhagen to see the drama unfold," said a disillusioned Angula. "The Accord is not a product of actual negotiations, but a face-saving document drawn up by powerful nations."

# África precisa de uma voz mais contundente

By Nasseem Ackburally

Copenhague - O primeiro-ministro da Etiópia, Meles Zenawi, causou indignação entre ativistas que participam da 15ª Conferência das Partes da Convenção Marco das Nações Unidas sobre Mudança Climática (COP-15) pela declaração que divulgou junto com o presidente da França, Nicolas Sarkozy. A reunião de Copenhague, que termina hoje, parece paralisada sem possibilidades de alcançar o ansiado acordo. O conteúdo do documento não atende as reclamações do grupo africano para redução de emissões contaminantes ou compromissos financeiros de longo prazo para ajudar a implementar medidas de mitigação, adaptação, entre outras ações no Sul em desenvolvimento.

Os representantes e delegados dos países presentes na capital dinamarquesa têm até hoje para acordar objetivos mais rígidos em matéria de redução de emissões de gases-estufa, que causam o aquecimento global, para as nações em desenvolvimento e outros mais para quem não assinou o Protocolo de Kyoto, que expira em 2012 e obriga os 37 países industriais que o ratificaram a reduzir suas emissões em 5,2% até 2012 com relação aos níveis de 1990.

Mithika Mwenda, da Aliança Pan-africana por Justiça Climática, e um dos decepcionados com a atitude de Zenawi, conversou a respeito com a IPS.

IPS - Qual a posição da Aliança Pan-africana por Justiça Climática a respeito da declaração do primeiro-ministro Meles Zenawi?

Mithika Mwenda - A declaração parece contradizer a posição da África. Reforça o que querem os países ricos: que o Protocolo de Kyoto fracasse, e isto é inaceitável. É uma demonstração de que não estão comprometidos com um acordo justo em Copenhague. Querem um tratado obrigatório, o que para nós é muito ruim. Estamos realmente surpresos por ver a pessoa que se supõe deveria falar pela África cair na armadilha. Pedimos ao nosso porta-voz que consulte os outros atores antes de declarações para não contradizer a posição africana.



Credit: TerraViva/Stephen Leahy

IPS - Quais consequências tem para a África essa declaração?

MM - Há muita indignação entre as nações africanas. Isso vai gerar discordância, isto é, divisões. Os que tentam dividir a África conseguirão. Não temos que cair na armadilha. Por isso dizemos que não agiu bem e que deve ouvir os demais. Precisamos que a África tenha uma voz forte e só podemos conseguir isso conversando entre nós.

IPS - Quanto a África está unida neste momento?

MM - É a região mais unida. Há muito intercâmbio com a conferência ministerial africana sobre meio ambiente. De fato, no último dia 16 foi discutida a declaração malauí e o grupo africano é o que impõe o ritmo aqui. É um grupo incrível graças à sua unidade. Estamos muito contentes. O bom é que a Aliança Pan-africana mantém um diálogo com nossos negociadores e outros atores e acreditamos que precisamos estar unidos e levar o trabalho adiante graças a essa unidade.

IPS - Qual posição a África deve adotar?

MM - Penso que temos de conseguir que o aquecimento global não aumente mais do que 1,5 grau. A declaração não menciona menos de dois graus. Também cremos que os US\$ 10 bilhões oferecidos pelos países industriais à África para medidas de adaptação e mitigação não são suficientes. Tem de haver maior compromisso.

IPS - Quanto dinheiro a África precisará para deter os efeitos da mudança climática?

MM - Nós africanos falamos de US\$ 400 bilhões ao ano nos próximos três. Compare isso com os US\$ 10 bilhões que nos dão. É um insulto para a África, que será a mais prejudicada pela mudança climática.

IPS - O dinheiro é a única solução para o problema da mudança climática?

MM - Os recursos podem ter muitas formas e uma delas é o dinheiro. A questão aqui é como nos adaptamos e necessitamos fundos para isso. O dinheiro é um aspecto importante porque precisa-se dele para tudo, incluída a transferência de tecnologia para a adaptação.

IPS - Por quanto tempo a África precisará de dinheiro?

MM - Falamos que até 2020 os países ricos terão de reduzir suas emissões em 45%, em relação aos níveis de 1990, e até 2050 entre 80% e 90%. Precisamos de fundos até então.

IPS - Isso será suficiente?

MM - Com sorte

IPS - O que esperam da COP-15?

MM - Esperamos um acordo obrigatório para as partes com uma via dupla, que mantenha e reforce o Protocolo de Kyoto. É o único acordo que obriga as nações industriais a reduzir suas emissões. Se perdermos o Protocolo de Kyoto, que, sabemos, não agrada muitos desses Estados, não haverá nenhum compromisso. Sabemos que muitas dessas nações nem mesmo se comprometeram com 5% porque não querem a única forma que têm de escapar é abandonar o acordo e negociar outro que dure mais e não menos de 10 anos.



# History Was Not Made in Copenhagen

By Stephen Leahy

**COPENHAGEN** - There is no Copenhagen climate treaty. History was not made at the December summit and no deal was sealed. After two years of intense negotiations by 194 countries, what is abundantly clear is the enormous divide between the rich and poor countries. Poor countries want deep cuts in emissions by the industrialised world, and the latter continue to resist significant cuts and legally binding targets.

Despite the enormous pressures, high expectations and last minute efforts by 128 heads of state, all that emerged is a vague agreement of sorts called the "Copenhagen Accord".

"Sealing the deal" on a new climate treaty was postponed for at least a year. Speaking of divides, civil society largely calls Copenhagen an utter disaster. It is a failure that "condemned millions of the world's poorest people to hunger, suffering and loss of life", said Nnimmo Bassey, chair of Friends of the Earth International.

On the other hand, U.S. President Barack Obama argued that a "meaningful and unprecedented breakthrough" had been made at press conference in the Bella Centre just before midnight Friday. "All major economies have come together to accept their responsibility to take action to confront the threat of climate change," he said.

Evidently, world leaders hadn't been paying much attention to the previous 15 years of climate treaty negotiations.

"Heads of state are now fully engaged," agreed Robert Orr, U.N. assistant secretary general for policy planning, speaking at a press conference. "Copenhagen was the first place were using the climate vocabulary."

"This has put climate on the map for leaders and leaders on the map for climate," he said.

Orr also said the gap between politics and science is finally beginning to close.

The hour is late for waking up to the reality of climate change. Two new scientific studies suggest that climate feedbacks will make the two-degree Celsius target unlikely to be achieved without "going negative" – meaning not only does the world have to go carbon-free in the coming decades, carbon will need to be removed from the atmosphere to lower concentrations to perhaps 350 ppm from today's 389 ppm.

It was late in the final hours of the meeting when the U.S. president announced that India, South Africa, China and Brazil had agreed to a backroom agreement called the Copenhagen Accord.

In the end, the accord has no legal standing under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and participating countries merely "note" its existence and express their support or not.

U.S. President Obama acknowledged that this was just one step on a long road to meet the apolitical targets of climate science. He insisted the Copenhagen Accord is an important first step because countries agreed to deep long-term cuts in emissions with the goal of holding the increase in global temperatures below two degrees.

Developing countries also agreed to take both voluntary action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to increase those actions if financial support was provided. And there was agreement that rich countries must mobilise 100 billion dollars a year by 2020 to help developing countries protect their forests, adapt to climate change and reduce their emissions.

They also agreed to work towards a legally binding treaty to be concluded by the end of next year in Mexico.

"The U.S. is not legally bound by anything that took place here in Copenhagen," Obama was careful to point out.

Domestically, the United States is a divided country, and a long way from making binding commitments on climate.

Not an hour after Obama's opening speech to the plenary Friday morning, several Republican members of Congress and the Senate held a press conference in the Bella Centre denying climate change was caused by emissions of fossil fuels and saying the science of the International Panel on Climate Change and dozens of scientific academies around the world was suspect. None of the U.S. politicians are scientists and all hail from regions with powerful fossil fuel or automotive interests.

"We have lost many things along the way," said Dessima Williams of Grenada, spokesperson for the 43-member Association of Small Island States (AOSIS), regarding their reluctant acceptance of the accord. "We have lost a vigorous commitment to stabilising global temperatures at 1.5 Degrees Celsius."

"We believe this is critical to the survival of our member states," Williams said in a final plenary session Saturday.

Women were also hoping for gender-sensitive text to acknowledge the reality that women are by far the most impacted by climate change, said Ana Rojas of Energia, an International Network of Gender and Sustainability based in the Netherlands.

Only a third of the delegates attending the conference this year are women, which can make it more difficult for equal representation of women and men's views in relation to climate change.

"We need a shared vision of gender in a final agreement. And not just concerning adaptation but also mitigation and financing," Rojas told TerraViva. While acknowledging that the accord represents some progress, it fell far short of the "fair, ambitious and legally binding agreement" that civil society had advocated. Outside the meetings, 1,800 protesters and media spokespersons were arrested on the suspicion they might do something illegal, in what civil society called attempts by the Danish government to suppress legitimate opposition and free speech.

The use of "tear gas, pepper spray, mass cages, baton charges and mass preemptive arrests sets a precedent dangerous not only for Denmark, but for the future of the world," said Tadzio Müller of Climate Justice Action, an international network of environmental and social justice groups.

"The world is facing tragic crises of leadership [on climate change]," said Greenpeace's international executive director, Kumi Naidoo.

The accord represents a "major concession to climate polluting industries, especially in the fossil fuel sector", Naidoo said. "Averting climate chaos has just gotten a whole lot harder."

The United Nations Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark took place from 7-19 December 2009. It included the fifteenth Conference of the Parties (COP 15) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the fifth Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP 5). COP 15 and COP/MOP 5 were held in conjunction with the thirty-first sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 31) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 31), the tenth session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP 10) and the eighth session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the UNFCCC (AWG-LCA 8).

# Beyond Copenhagen

By Dr Lindiwe Majele Sibanda

PRETORIA - In December 2009, a total of 120 Heads of State and Government, 10,500 delegates, 13,500 observers, and 3,000 media representatives met in Copenhagen, Denmark for the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP15). Africa, the continent predicted to be the most vulnerable to climate change for the first time went to the climate change negotiations with a united voice and one clear message to deliver to its peers: "A Climate Change Deal without Agriculture is No Deal for Africa".

FANRPAN under the auspice of the COMESA funded Africa - wide Civil Society Climate Change Initiative for Policy Dialogues (ACCID) partnered with regional and international partners in building consensus on ways to fully incorporate agriculture into the post-Copenhagen climate agenda and to discuss strategies and actions needed to address climate change adaptation and mitigation in the agriculture sector. FANRPAN's active and visible participation during the Agriculture Day event organised by the Challenge Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFFS), IFPRI and the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development (Platform) in Copenhagen on the 12th of December further grounded Africa's position on climate change. The event was attended by over 350 participants, including representatives from governments, UN and international agencies, businesses, NGOs, academia and farmers who endorsed the FANRPAN coined motto "No Agriculture No Deal".

Although the Copenhagen Accord was disappointing in that the agreement was not legally binding, it was not all bad news. The good news is that agriculture has made significant advances in the dialogue surrounding a future climate change regime. The Copenhagen Accord endorses the decisions of the Ad hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA), which opens the door for agriculture. The AWG-LCA has specific language on agriculture in the negotiations of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long Term Cooperation Action (AWG-LCA), under the topic of sectoral approaches to mitigation. The current version of the text, which is included in a "non paper" that will continue to be negotiated in 2010, recognises the importance of food security to address climate change challenges, as well as the relationship between agriculture and food security and the clear link between adaptation and mitigation in the context of agriculture. It also includes a request for the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) to establish a programme of work on agriculture. While Copenhagen did not succeed in finalising the negotiations of the AWG-LCA, countries decided to carry negotiations forward towards an eventual agreement in Mexico. Among countries that responded, twelve submissions from developing countries (out of thirty-two) specifically mentioned the agricultural sector among their mitigation actions.

The developing country mitigation actions submitted in February 2010 to the UNFCCC Secretariat reflect different national capacities, conditions and perspectives. They include some of the key mitigation technologies and practices currently commercially available in the agricultural sector. These technologies and practices consist of: 1) improved crop and

grazing land management to increase soil carbon storage; 2) restoration of cultivated peaty soils and degraded lands; 2) improved rice cultivation techniques and livestock and manure management to reduce methane emissions; 3) improved nitrogen fertilizer application techniques to reduce nitrous oxide emissions; 4) dedicated energy crops to replace fossil fuel use; and 5) improved energy efficiency.

It is encouraging to see that of the 12 countries that have submitted mitigation actions, six of these countries are from Africa. Republic of Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Morocco, and Sierra Leone, are some of the developing countries that made submissions within the agricultural sector. For example Ethiopia submitted voluntary Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) hoping these actions will be supported financially and technologically as promised in the Copenhagen Accord. With regards to the agricultural sector, Ethiopia proposes to increase carbon soil sequestration by developing compost in rural local communities' agricultural land and implementing agro-forestry practices and systems. In addition, the country will seek to produce ethanol and biodiesel for road transport and household use. Morocco has suggested improving the productivity of its agricultural land whilst Sierra Leone proposed the introduction of conservation farming and the promotion of other sustainable agricultural practices such as agro-forestry.

COP15's recognition of the importance of agriculture in tackling climate change is, therefore, no small achievement. The challenge for all of us now is not to lose heart and momentum but to carry that momentum forward. Of note in efforts to include agriculture in the post Kyoto decision is the establishment of the Global Research Alliance on Agricultural Greenhouse Gases. The alliance seeks international cooperation and investment to study agriculture's role in climate change, including the amount of greenhouse gases emitted in fields. Other aims include helping scientists gain expertise in, and technology for, mitigation and adaptation; facilitating information exchange among scientists globally; and improving access to and sharing of knowledge by farmers. It also seeks to identify gaps in existing research and to coordinate scientific collaboration; encourage dissemination of research and develop new partnerships among scientists, international research institutes, farmers' organisations and civil society organisations. While it is clear that continued work on a long term, comprehensive and effective approach to climate change adaptation and mitigation through agriculture, in a post-2012 setting is necessary. There is an emerging consensus that agriculture should be part of post 2012 agreements there is still much work to do on determining the best mechanisms to achieve this.

For Africa, forestry and agriculture are where poverty reduction, food security and climate change come together! Significant financial resources and political will are needed to better address food security, slow deforestation and forest degradation, and reach emission reduction



Credit: Zahira Kharsany/ IPS

targets. As we head towards Cop 16 Cancun 2010, Africa must engage pro-actively with the UNFCCC processes to make sure that Africa's needs are taken into account, that the role of agriculture in climate change adaptation is given due weight.

Efforts should be made to build up institutional capacity in order for African countries to be able to prepare National Action Plans, to develop and submit funding proposals to existing financial mechanisms such as the Clean Investment Funds, but also to demonstrate that new funding will be used effectively. Countries should therefore promote investment opportunities; establish the regulatory frameworks which will encourage private sector involvement, and promote energy efficiency. Investments must be transparent and additional to support for global food security and rural development. These resources must be accessible to all stakeholders, including researchers, civil society and especially forest communities, farmers and their associations. Resources must also be devoted to the research necessary to underpin needed advances in the effectiveness, efficiency, and equity of agriculture and forestry-based approaches to mitigation and adaptation.

Furthermore, policy processes need to be empowering and adaptive to respond to realities on the ground, the desires and aspirations of local communities, and ensure good governance. In particular, the role of African institutions in sustainable natural resources management should be given increased recognition, and the rights and roles of indigenous and local and farming communities especially women and young farmers must be recognized in developing national mitigation and adaptation strategies. FANRPAN with the support of COMESA is committed to strengthening cross-sectoral cooperation to address the policy challenges of Africa with regards to climate change. We recognize that addressing climate change is fundamental to food security and poverty reduction today and for future generations; therefore there should be "No Climate Deal without Agriculture".

*Dr. Lindiwe Majele Sibanda is the FANRPAN Chief Executive Officer.*